IMT Nuremberg Archives

H – 167

International Court of Justice

H0167 – 0002

Official Transcript of the International Military Tribunal in the matter of The United States of America, the French Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics against Hermann Wilhelm Goering et al, Defendants, sitting at Nurnberg, Germany, on 27 June 1946, 1000-1700, Lord Justice Lawrence presiding.

THE MARSHAL : If it please the Tribunal, the report is made that defendant Ribbentrop is absent.

DR. FRITZ : Mr. President, first a very brief explanation. Yesterday I repeatedly mentioned the Indictment and intend to do so in the course of the examination. I also mentioned the presentation of Fritsche's case by Captain Sprecher, of the session of the 23rd of January 1946.

BY DR. FRITZ :

Q Mr. Fritsche, yesterday you spoke of your radio speeches concerning the Allied propaganda. My last question. Did you attempt to split the front of the Allies by your propaganda ?

A Of course, I attempted to do that. All idelogical and all practical political contrasts or differences between the individual Allied Nations I worked out. I considered that a permissible method of waging war. At that time, I wanted a split between the Allies just as much as today I wish their unity, since German would be the first victim of any conflict.

Q Now, you are accused as assisting in strengthening Nazi controle throughout Germany. Did you agitate against Democracy ?

A I never agitated against Democracy as such. I spoke against the democracy of the thirty-six parties. The democracy which had prevailed in Germany previously, the democracy under which strong groups were powerless, such as the Marxist parties, for example; the foreign democracy I criticized only for two points; first, for the elements which limited the basic thought of democraties. I believe it is superfluous; perhaps it would be misunderstood to enumerate them today. Secondly, I criticized the demands of the foreign democracies to force their form of government on us. At the time, according to my knowledge and information at the time, it seemed unjustified to me.

Q Then, did you consider dictatorship a better form of government ?

A I should like to express that. At that time, under the conditions at that time, when only for a temporary emergency period, yes; today, of course not. After the totalitarian form of government has led to the catastrophy of

the murder of five million, I consider this form of government wrong even in times of emergency. I believe any kind of democratic control, even limited democratic control would have made such a catastrophy impossible.

H0167 - 0003

H0167-0004

Q You are accused, furthermore, of having spread the doctrine of the master race. The prosecution makes this charge indirectly against you. How about that?

A I never set up or represented the theory of the master race. I even avoided this term. I expressly prohibited this term for the German Press and the German radio at the time when I was in charge of one or the other. I believe that the term "master race" played a greater role in the anti-Nationalist propaganda than in Germany proper. I do not know who invented this term. To my knowledge, it was publicly mentioned only by men like Dr. Ley, for example, and I must explain this frankly and expressly, these men were not taken seriously by anyone in this connection. It is true, however, that this term played a great role, without being expressed openly, in the SS because of its racial exclusiveness, but people of intelligence, tact, of insight and some knowledge of the world avoided the use of this word extremely carefully.

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, at this opportunity, I should like to offer an affidavit to the Tribunal by Dr. Scharping of the 17th of May, 1946. Dr. Scharping was Government Councillor in the Propaganda Ministry to the end. From this affidavit I shall now quote only one sentence from Page 13. I quote: "In this connectior it can be explained that Fritsche always opposed the term "the maste race". He even expressly prohibited the use of this word on the radio."

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q But the prosecution has given a question from one of your radio speeches to prove this assertion.

A The quotation is correct, but I ask you to read it carefully. The term "master race" is rejected in this quotation for the Jewish and for the German people. The quotation should not be misunderstood.

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, that is in Captain Sprecher's speech for the prosecution, in the English text on Page 31 in the record.

H0167-0005

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q But you carried on propaganda not only in Germany but abroad. What was the difference?

A In my radio speeches there was no difference. Before the outbreak of war I made a slight difference in the speeches for Germany and those for other countries because the audience was different and because I had to presuppose a different level of knowledge. During the war my speeches on the Reich German radio were simply transmitted over the short wave station. What was said for Germany or for other countries could be mutually controlled. In the twelve years during which I spoke on the German radio, I never permitted my speeches to be translated, since that always involved a difference of emphasis. Articles can be translated, perhaps official speeches can be, but not my talks, which were rather light and half improvised.

Q Were your broadcasts abroad criticized internationally?

A Yes, frequently. During the war there was often daily criticism from some country or other. I had these criticisms collected. I asked for them as documents but my application was refused. As far as I know, I am not accused of war agitation in these criticisms.

Q Now you not only acted as a speaker in propaganda but also as an organizer. You are accused of having helped to create an important instrument for the asserted conspiracy. The prosecution says that for thirteen years you aided in the creation of the propaganda machine which the conspiracy was able to put to such good use. Did you create the Press organization of the National Socialist State?

A No, I did not create this organization nor did I have any part in its creation. Its creator was Dr. Goebbels, Dr. Dietric and Reichsleiter Amann. When, in the winter of 1938, I became head of the so-called German Press Section, I attempted to loosen the bonds which had been imposed on the German Press. I attempted that in the material and personal field. For example, hundreds of edi-

H0167-0006

tors of other parties who had been dismissed in 1933 and '34 I recalled to the Press. Today they will be angry at me. I had good intentions at the time. Then, in addition to the official Press conferences, which were very strictly controlled in their records by my superiors, I arranged so-called supplementary conferences in which I met with the representatives of the fifty or sixty more important papers and discussed more freely the possibilities of their work. I coined the slogan which was often used there: You can write any criticism in the German papers if you do not put this criticism in big headlines but put it in the text in an elegant form. Many German journalists made use of this possibility in the past twelve years. I would be glad if this work, which was a hidden work, could be honored in some way today in the interest of these people who have, in part, returned to their profession as journalists out of personal confidence in me. Of course I must add that the possibility of criticizing was not unlimited.

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, at this opportunity, with the approval of the prosecution, I offer the Tribunal a document as Fritsche Exhibit No. 4. It is an excerpt from a letter of the German Lt. General Dittmar, who frequently commented on the military situation on the German radio during the war and who is an English prisoner. The well known English radio commentator, Mr. Lidell-Hart, sent the British prosecution an excerpt from the letter. This memorandum which was sent to me, I should like to quote briefly. May I quote this passage?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you may.

DR. FRITZ: Dittmar writes: "The possibility of retaining the critical attitude in his radio commentary is due primarily to the silent approval and the protection of Hans Fritsche, the head of the political radio. He believes that Fritsche was a secre opponent of the regime and was glad of the chance to have found a commentator who discreetly expressed ideas which resembled his own and which insiduously would tend to reduce confidence in the regime.

H0167-0007

And following this quotation, there is another quotation from the affidavit of Dr. Scharping which I have already submitted as Fritsche Exhibit No. 2. It is on page 11 of this affidavit. I quote:

" The radio people and the journalists knew Fritsche's tolerance quite well. It repeatedly happened that Fritsche at his conferences had, for example, a copy of the Voelkischer Beobachter in his hand and commented ironically on an anti-Jewish article. I recall that one time he expressed his criticism in about the following words, 'A Berlin paper' -- then he held the Voelkischer Beobachter up so that everyone could see it -- 'has once more, in an editorial, hit more than two birds with one stone. Perhaps the publisher will succeed in getting the right stone.'

"With such ironical remarks, Fritsche always had the approval of his listeners, but there was some danger for him, for Goebbels daily read the records of these press conferences."
BY DR. FRITZ:

Q Mr. Fritsche, following the statement of Lt. General Dittmar, one question: Did you feel yourself to be an enemy of the system, or how does General Dittmar come to this statement?

A I was not an enemy of the system. It would be ridiculous and unworthy to try to assert that today. But I was definitely an opponent of all misuse of the system which I could recognize. The one which I noticed the most, because it was in my field of work, was whitewashing of news during the war. The aim of all my news policy was realism, and apparently that is what General Dittmar means in the part of his statement which has been read here.

I met General Dittmar in December 1942 or January 1943, at the moment when the Sixth German Army at Stalingrad was surrounded, but when this fact was still being kept secret from the German people. Together with General ittmar, I publicly announced the fact that the S ixt Army was surrounded at Stalingrad, against

H0167-0008

the prohibition. This caused a great sensation at the time.

In the following months and year, I always defended General Dittmar and his realistic presentation of the military situation against all attacks, especially against the attacks of the P arty, but also the attacks of the Foreign Office which repeatedly pointed out that these objective presentations of Dittmar had a bad effect on Germany's allies.

In connection with this struggle for realistic news service later -- and I ask permission to mention this briefly -- I waged a desperate battle against the irresponsible propaganda of miracle weapons. Only one year after Dr. Goebbels had mentioned miracle weapons, I mentioned a new type of weapon for the first time. Speer has mentioned SS Standartenfuehrer Berg, who is said to have carried on secret propaganda for the miracle weapon in connection with the Prop aganda Ministry. He wrote an artide in Das Reich which attracted much attention, with the sensational heading, "We, the Bearers of Secrets." I had to fight against such things.

Another especially striking example was this. Another member of the SS, Hernau, wrote, at the moment when the invasion had succeeded, an article in which he presented the situation as if the evacuation of France had been a very secret trick of the German Command, which was only creating the possibility for a very strong counter-blow. I prohibited this article in my field, and I repeatedly had to oppose the irresponsible rumors which were spread in secret about mysterious weapons. I did so publicly, and I spoke on the radio against this propaganda.

On the other hand I may point out that at every moment of the war my superiors always made promises to me, first, of a military offensive which was just being prepared, for instance, a thrust from East Prussia toward the south, a thrust from Upper Silesia to the Vistula, a thrust from Alsace toward the north, and so forth. Hand in hand with these promises which were worked out in detail were the political promises which were mentioned briefly yesterday, the descriptions given by Dr. Goebbels that

H0167-0009

foreign political negotiations were in progress with one or another enemy.

Q Another question: Who was in charge of press policy?

A Reich Press Chief Dr. Dietrich. He gave quite specialized instructions, mostly in a wording which was strictly said, the so-called slogan of the day of the Reich Press Chief. Generally he gave the commentaries which were to be added to the press conference.

For the most part, Dr. Dietrich was at the Fuehrer's headquarters and received his instructions directly from Hitler. Dr. Dietrich's representatives were Sudndermann and Lorenz.

The second factor decisive for German press policy was Reichsleiter Amann who was at the head of the organization of publishers. The third factor was Dr. Goebbels as Reich Propaganda Minister. Dietrich and Amann were formally subordinate to him; in fact, both had equal authority with him and I always had to adjust differences or coordinate between these three authorities.

Q Did you create the organization of the journalistic news service?

A Yes, I did create this organization. On principle, it originated with me. I may refer to my affidavit, 3469-PS, Point 17. I took care of the journalistic news service from about 1934 to 1938. I was proud of the fact that at the beginning of the war the enemy even recognized the good functioning of this news machine. At that time, I was no longer the head of this news service department. However, as an expert I created this organization in peacetime without thinking of its possibility of use during war. The conclusion of the Prosecution that I determined the contents of the news service is not correct.

Q The Prosecution has said that the Propaganda Ministry was the most fabulous lie factory of all times. What do you have to say about this?

A First, for myself personally, I should like to make

H0167-0010

the following quite clear. I state under oath, in newly serious questions of policy and conduct of war, I did not commit a single falsification and did not consciously speak a single lie.

H0167-0011

How often I myself was the victim of a falsehood or a lie I cannot say as to the revelations of this trial. The same is true as far as I know of all my fellow-workers but I do not by any means want to deny that I and my fellow-workers selected news and quotations according to a tendency. It is the curse of propaganda during war that one works only with black and white and there are only a few great spirits. I believe that this painting in black and white is a luxury which one cannot afford anymore.

As to the Propaganda Ministry itself, as such, I must say that I can only judge of the twelve sections, the one of which I was in charge at any time. But to my knowledge it is a mistake to believe that in the Propaganda Ministry thousands of little lies were thought out. In detail we worked quite cleanly and honestly, technically completely so. If we had lied in a thousand small things the enemy would have been able to deal with us more easily than was the case. But decisive for us for such a news machine is not the detail but the final fundamental basis on which propaganda is built. Decisive is the belief in the purity of the leaders of the state, on which every journalist must rely and this basis was shaken by what has become known today; of mass murders, senseless atrocities and it is shaken by the doubt in the honesty of Hitler's protestations for peace, the details of which I am in no position to judge.

Q. In this trial it has been pointed out that there are no regulations under international law on the use of propaganda in war and peace.

A. I know very well that international law places no boundries on propaganda especially propaganda during war. I also know very well that only in a very few, individual treaties between states are there regulations about the use of propaganda; for example in the German-Polish treaty and in the German-Soviet Union treaty. But in all my life as a journalist I have emphasized that the lack of international regulations as to propaganda is no pass for lies. I always felt and emphasized the responsibility of the journalist. I did so long before the war in an international discussion with radio Luxembourg but I need not go into that here.

If last May I did not seek death, one of the reasons for this was my wish -- I wanted to account for where in the system was the limit of idealism and sacrifices and where there were lies and the brutality which was not afraid of committing crimes.

Q. Please give us examples of cases wherein you felt you were deceived ?

A. During this trial the news was discussed that at the beginning of the Polish war there was news of the attack on the Gleiwitz radio station. At that time I firmly believed in the correctness of the official German news. I need say nothing about this case.

Then, in December of last year, here in the prison in Nurnberg, from a talk with Grand Admiral Raeder I realized that it was actually a German submarine which sank the "Athenia". Up to that time I had firmly believed in the truth of the official German report that there had been no German submarine in the neighborhood. I asked my lawyer to pick out what I had said in my radio speeches about the "Athenia" case, things which would really speak against me but which, on the other hand, show that I worked not alone on the basis of the official German news but that I also collected the news which supported the official German version; for example, the fact which was not at first made public and therefore was suspicious, that the wreck of the "Athenia" one day after the catastrophy, was sunk by being shelled by British destroyers, which is a matter, of course, in the interest of shipping but which at the time seemed to be to me an occasion for suspicion. I also used American news on the same subject. But the most impressive false news of which I was a victim was given out in the last few days of the war. I must describe it in the interest of clearing matters up.

In the days when Berlin was surrounded by the Russian Army the people of Berlin were told that a relief army, the Weng Army, was marching on Berlin; that there was no more fighting on the western front. The news was given out that Ribbentrop had gone to the Western Front and had concluded a treaty there and handbills were printed in Berlin which contained approximately this text; "Soldiers of the Weng Army, we Berliners know that you are as far as Potsdam. Hurry, help us."

These handbills were printed at a time when the Weng Army no longer existed and had already been captured. These handbills were dropped over Berlin ostensibly by mistake and were to give the inhabitants of Berlin new courage. That was done in the days when Hitler, according to Speer's testimony, had already told his entourage that there was no use trying to do anything for the rest of the German people.

H0167 - 0012

DR. FITZ: Mr. President, the two radio speeches which the defendant Fritsche has mentioned, dealing with the "Athenia" case are in the document Fritsche Exhibit Number 1, which I submitted yesterday. I refer only to the contents of these radio speeches.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q. Please give examples of untruths which you knew and which you did not consider lies ?

A. One example is the so-called "V" drive. A colonel, a British colonel on the British radio proclaimed this "V" drive, Colonel Britton, this "Victory" drive. On the same evening I stood before a German microphone and said, apparently harmlessly --"We will have a "V" drive, the "V" stands for Victoria."

Then Colonel Britton said that I had stolen the "V" from him. I said that was not the case, I thought of it first.

Q. If you thought you were operating only with the truth, why your sharp language, why the prohibition against listening on the radio to foreign stations ?

A. I have already emphasized in my affidavit that in my opinion the sharpness of my language was less than that of my opponents. The prohibition against listening to foreign radio stations was issued against my will. For me this prohibition was only a hindrance in my discussion with my foreign opponents in the various countries. In this type of prohibition my enemy was, so to speak, in half shadow, I could not speak to him officially. But, on the other hand, I knew that many of my listeners had heard him and they mention here that always advocated a mild judgment of the violaters of this prohibition against listening to foreign radio stations. Justice officials often asked me as an expert. I may emphasize that particularly after Stalingrad I established my own monitoring service for the Russian radio in order to learn the names of German soldiers captured at Stalingrad which were mentioned on the Russian radio and report them to the relatives because it seemed cruel to me to deprive the relatives of such a source of information about the date of their people.

H0167 - 0013

H0167-0014

Moreover, there was only one alternative to the question of prohibition of listening to the radio. That was to confiscate all radios and stop the whole German radio system. The Party often demanded this. The prohibition against listening to foreign stations seemed to me the lesser of the two evils.

Finally, we were in a war, and the enemy was not too particular in his methods. I should like to give an example. That was the station Gustav Siegfried, which at the beginning of its work tried to gain listeners in Germany with descriptions that I shall not give in detail but which occasioned me to prohibit my own monitoring station from receiving this broadcast.

Q You have been charged with urging a policy of ruthless exploitation of the occupied territories. Do you acknowledge such a policy?

A No. The aim of all my propaganda work in Europe was, and had to be, to win over the peoples of Europe to the German cause. Anything else would have been illogical. All the radio broadcasts in all European languages which were made under my direction for years had only one aim. That was to win the voluntary cooperation, especially of the occupied territories, for the fight of the Reich.

Q Were you of the opinion that the German administration in the occupied territories recruited voluntary cooperation?

A At the beginning, certainly, with one single exception. That was Koch in the Ukraine. Otherwise, as far as I could see, all administrations of occupied territories sought this collaboration more or less skillfully. I saw the gigantic efforts which the Allies made to interfere with this German collaboration policy, which was very dangerous to them. I saw these efforts of the Allies, at first by means of propaganda. This alone would not have worked. Then I saw these efforts by other means, and methods of attacks and sabotage. These efforts had great success. Attacks always called for reprisal and reprisals always called forth new attacks.

I hope I will not be misunderstood, and this is not meant cynically, if I say the following: I, as a propagandist, considered, fo

H0167-0015

example, the murder of Heydrich as a small success. The destruction of Lidici, carried out by the Germans, however, was a tremendous success for the Allies. In other words, I always was and had to be an opponent of reprisals of all kinds.

Q Did you know of the reprisals? How did you deal with them in your propaganda?

A I learned of Lidici, which I just mentioned, only after months, because at that time I was at the Eastern Front. I learned--and this is significant -- of the destruction of the houses of Lidici and the driving out of the inhabitants. I learned only here in the Courtroom of the killing of a part of the inhabitants. I learned that hostages were taken, but not that they were killed. The killing of hostages was made public only in the occupied territories. If shootings occurred anywhere, I was told that they had been of persons condemned to death. The Nacht und Nebel Decree was also unknown to me.

On the other hand, I frequently learned of fines which had been imposed on states or districts. In all propaganda, we always referred to the causes of such reprisals.

Q And how did you describe the work of the German administrations in your propaganda?

A I always referred to the constructive work which, in spite of all difficulties and all resistance, was being done in th various occupied territories, especially -- and far at the head -- the work for the intensification of agriculture; then that to increase industrial production. Then I had references made to the supplying of the occupied territories with food, often, as I should like to emphasize, from the scant German supplies. I had reports made of the creation of schools, and I received at times very impressive reports and had them worked on, for example, on the supplying of cities such as Paris, in spite of the attacks of the enem against railroad lines or other transportation. I had such reports collected in permanent files and had speeches and whole series of speeches made on them. There were many such reports. I must empha-

H0167-0016

size that as far as I know, in not a single German occupied territory was there an infant mortality of 80 per cent, and in none were there fields lying fallow, and it is simply not true, as the Prosecution said here once, although in a moment of excitement, that Germany and the Germans were well fed and happy during the war while the occupied territories starved. That is not true.

Q What did you know about bad conditions in the occupied territories?

A Above all, the failure to call on the population for their own administration and their lack of decisive political concessions in the countries which administered themselves. Immediately after the French campaign, I had repeatedly demanded the establishment of a Magna Charta, laying down the basic rights of the European peoples. I prepared many memoranda on this subject which were accepted by Dr. Goebbels, taken to Hitler, and when in the fall of 1942 I decided to return to the Propaganda Ministry, one of the promises which Dr. Goebbels gave me was the promise that now finally this Magna Charta would be proclaimed.

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, on this occasion I should like to quote a passage from the Scharping affidavit, document Fritsche Exhibit No. 2. Page 13 of the affidavit.

"After the occupation of various European countries, Fritsche issued directives for news to the effect that the peoples of Europe were to conclude a league of states on the basis of equality with Germany. He told me to work out a series of speeches to this effect in which this point of view was to play the decisive role and which at the same time would give the agencies hints for the reconstructio in the occupied territories."

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q Did you know what has been said here by the Prosecution about the activity of the police in the occupied territories?

A No.

Q Another question: I have asked the witness Paulus about your conduct after you learned of the Commissar Order. How about that?

H0167-0017

A The order to shoot captured Soviet Commissars I learned of at the beginning of May 1942 when I came to the Sixth Army. I immediately opposed it. Whether it was carried out or not, I do not know. Field Marshal Paulus is doubtless correct when he says that in his army he had already prevented the execution of this order. At any rate, I made it my business to have the order as su rescinded, and I achieved this. The Sixth Army at my advice gave certain information to the High Command. I am of the conviction that many army leaders acted in the same way as the leader of the Sixth Army and simply did not carry out the order. At any rate, it was expressly rescinded.

Q The Prosecution quotes two paragraphs from your radio speech of 5 July 1941.

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, that is in the English record of Captain Sprecher, page 32-33.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q The Prosecution concludes from this presentation that you had agitated for ruthless measures against the population of the Soviet Union.

THE PRESIDENT: We can not find it here. What is the PS number?

DR. FRITZ: It is in the transcript, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: We have not got the transcript here. We have the document book. The document book does not contain 32 and 33 pages. It only contains 32--or 31 and a little bit.

DR. FRITZ: The number is 3084 PS, US Exhibit 723.

THE PRESIDENT: It is page 14 in our book. Well, did you say 5 July?

DR. FRITZ: 5 July, 5 July 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I have got the 7th and 10th of Jul but not the 5th. What page in the shorthand notes was it?

DR. FRITZ: On page 32, page 33 in the English transcrip I have the English transcript here.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you had better read it then.

H0167 - 0018

DR. FRITZ; This quotation from Captain Sprecher's speech for the Prosecution reads:

"As letters from the front given to foreign correspondent wherever the German Army advanced and soldiers on leave confirm, in this battle in the East, it is not one ideology fighting against another, not one political system against another, but culture, civilization, and human dignity fighting against devilish principles of an underworld."

A I should like to state that I was not calling for ruthless measures against the population of the Soviet Union, nor did I want to villify the people of the Soviet Union.

I refer to the total effect of the speech of the 5th of July. I do not wish to read this speech, but I should like permission to sum it up briefly.

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, in my document book 1-- I do not know whether the Tribunal already has it--

THE PRESIDENT: No, we haven't go it.

DR. FRITZ: --I have all these radio speeches of the defendant Frisenne, from which the prosecution quoted passages against him. I have included them in their full text.

THE PRESIDENT: It has just been handed up to me. What page is it?

DR. FRITZ: Pages 8 to 13. That is the radio speech of the 5th of July, 1941.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q. Will you continue?

A. I ask for permission to sum up the contents very briefly.

I spoke of the report which the German public received about what German soldiers had seen in their advance in the Soviet Union, especially as to prisoners killed in the prisons in various cities. I did not describe these things once more, I only recalled them from the reports which had been given out at the time. From them I drew the conclusion that now one saw how necessary the fight was against a system under which such atrocities were possible. For the peoples of the Soviet Union I expressly used words of sympathy.

Q. In the same connection, and with the same tendency, the prosecution then quotes a sentence from a paragraph of your radio speech of the 10th of July 1941.

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, that is in document 1 -- the speech of the 10th of July 1941--also in its full text, on pages 14 to 19.

Q (Continuing) What do you have to say to this charge?

A. In this quotation, and in this whole speech, what I just said becomes even clearer. I referred once more to the reports just mentioned. I also referred to the descriptions of foreign correspondents. I then,,quite frankly, reported

Moscow's attitude towards these events and I said, quite honestly, "Radio Moscow says that these atrocities are facts, but it maintains that these atrocities were not committed by Russians but by Germans".

In view of this attitude of Moscow, I, so to speak, fled into publicity. I called millions of German soldiers as witnesses - called their mothers and fathers and wives as witnesses. I finally called as witnesses the inhabitants of the occupied territories in which Germans were in power at the time, and in which, as I said, they were subordinated only to the normal law in their own breasts. Then I drew the conclusion: These German soldiers cannot have committed the atrocities, which were described by Berlin and Moscow equally.

The prosecution asserted that this attempt to ascribe German atrocities to the Russians was ridiculous. I do not consider it ridiculous, I consider it tragic. It shows clearly, as I understand it, all the honesty of my conviction at that time, of the absolute cleanliness and honesty of the whole German conduct of the war. I still believe today that murder and violence and special commandos, Sonderkommandos, were a foreign body from the more or less sound body of the German people and its Wehrmacht.

Q. Finally, the prosecution quotes a passage from your speech of the 9th of October 1941, another quotation from which was brought out elsewhere.

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, this is in the Fritzsche document book 1, the speech in its full text is on pages 20 to 25. The quotation of the prosecution are summed up in a document in the Fritzsche document book of the prosecution, so that the Tribunal can compare it.

Q (Continuing) The prosecution concludes from this quotation that this was enthusiasm for the policy of the Nazi conspirators in their ruthless exploitation of the occupied territories.

What have you to say to that?

H0167-0020

A. There is no question of ruthlessness either in the quotation given by the prosecution or in the rest of the text of the speech of the 9th of July, 1941. I refer to my affidavit 3469-PS, paragraph 39, a paragraph which the prosecution very fairly quoted in this connection.

In addition, may I once more sum up, very briefly, the sense of this speech?

That was a time when German soldiers were stationed from the Black Sea to the Bay of Biscay. I spoke of the possibility of using the resources of this enormous territoy. I said, "The possibilities of this continent are so significant that they can cover any need for war and for peace." I said, in this connection, that a starving out by blockade, such as was attempted in 1914-1918, was not out of the question. I spoke of the possibilities of the organization of Europe which could begin in the war. By that I meant the organization of European nations with equal rights.

It is beyond all doubt that at that time I was not thinking of ruthless exploitation of the occupied territories, but only winning them over politically and economically after the temporary phenomenon of war.

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, I now come to another subject, so perhaps this would be a good time to break off.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

DR. THOMA: (Counsel for the defendant Rosenberg): I have a request, Mr. President. I should like to speak for my client now. I would like to have my client excused from now on.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, certainly.

(A recess was taken).

H0167 - 0021

BY DR. FRITZ :

Q What did you know about the transporting away of Jews out of the occupied countries ?

A I did not know anything of the transporting away into to, but I heard that special individuals were being arrested, Jews, and non-Jews.

Q What did you know about the topic which we discussed here of slave labor ?

A I knew that millions of foreign workers were working in the Reich. I did not consider them slaves, for I saw them daily walking about free on the streets of all the cities.

Q What did you know about their treatment, about their living conditions, and their wages ?

A Reports about these things were sent to me or to my co-workers, reports which came from the office of Sauckel and the German Labor Front. From these reports, among other things, I remember the fact that the foreign workers were put on the same basis and in the same position as the German workers, in every way. I further recall from the time that they came in that the so-called inferior treatment accorded Eastern workers had been done away with. I received reports from listeners complaining about the fact that foreign workers had a so-called better position than German workers; and in this connection, I remember a reference to the fact that the foreign workers were permitted to send home money in the form of exchange.

Many times I talked with foreign workers. I did not hear any specific or special complaints; but, on the other hand, in the Propaganda Ministry, through official channels, I heard very much about the care that was being given to foreign workers, even along cultural lines. Frequently I was approached by Sauckel or the German Labor Front -- I do not remember which it was -- with the request to have radio broadcasts sent to one or another group of foreign workers. I was approached also with the request for receiving programs to be given in camps of foreign workers.

Q Did you know that most of them did not come to Germany voluntarily ?

A That was the very part that I did not know. Here in this proceeding it was mentioned that Sauckel in one meeting or another made a statement about the fact that only a small percentage had come voluntarily, and that was the thing that was unknown to me. I heard the following complaints : First of all,

H0167 - 0022

that extravagant promises were made at the time of recruitment of the foreign workers, which promises could not be kept afterwards.

Contrary to that, I had doubts and misgivings raised in my propaganda when I heard about that, and these doubts were raised in each section of the Propaganda Ministry. I remember having heard complaints from Poland dealing with the fact that employers were "pirating" Polish workers from each other.

Q Sauckel testified that in this connection he cooperated with the Propaganda Ministry and that he had many discussions with the Propaganda Ministry. Did you participate in these discussions and conferences ?

A No, I did not participate in these conferences. I believe that I met Sauckel here, and he reminded me of a meeting in the spring of 1945 at the home of Dr. Goebbels when there was some evening gathering taking place.

Q Did you have anything to do with the propaganda used in the recruitment of foreign workers in occupied countries ?

A No.

Q What did you have to do with the propaganda which was disseminated in the occupied countries ?

A This propaganda as it applied to occupied countries was not under my supervision, or was not subordinate to me, not even in the branches of the press or radio. This propaganda was used under the direction and supervision of the Reich Commissar, military commander-in-chief, or governor. However, I did exert influence on this propaganda in the occupied countries. This took place on two, three or four occasions.

If this propaganda in the occupied countries was contrary to the fundamentals and principles which existed in the Reich, I should have been able to gather this from the echo abroad. I remember one special case which received special attention, when, in the case of the German radio in Paris, a certain man by the name of Friedrich attacked the Pope. I had this man Friedrich replaced. That was the extent of the influence I could make felt.

Dr. Goebbels, however, exerted rather more influence on the propaganda in the occupied countries, and he especially by way of his branch Ausland, or the branch Auslandspresse, Foreign Press, or by way of his liaison officer to the OKW used these various channels of exerting his influence.

Q Did you not give out any radio broadcasts to the occupied countries ?

H0167-0023

A Yes, broadcasts of two types. An example for the first type is as follows. At the time of the occupation, Radio Paris was under German influence. Despite that, I retained the old German broadcast in the French language via Radio Stuttgart. I wanted to have it understood quite specifically that the occupation was an abnormal and a temporary situation, and anything that was taking place during the period of occupation did not have anything to do with that part of, let us say, German-French understanding and language exchange which was being carried on by these two mother countries.

The second example is as follows. It concerns German broadcasts in the Spanish and Portuguese languages. I had these transmitted through three stations in Southern France, for it was easier to receive these transmitters in the Pyrenees region. The basis for my work in this connection was a contract which we had with these stations, and the payment of regular charges. Negotiations for this contract were carried out through the Foreign Office.

Q I shall now turn to a different topic. You are accused of making anti-Semitic statements. Were you anti-Semitic, and in what way did you participate in anti-Semitic propaganda ?

A I was not anti-Semitic in the idea of a noisy anti-Semitism. The prosecution has asserted that all defendants -- that is, including myself -- shouted, "Germany awake, and Judism die." I will state under my oath, never did I raise cry to this effect or one similar to it. I was not anti-Semitic in the sense of the radical theories or methods beginning with Fritsche to Streicher.

The prosecution has stated, even the defendant Streicher, the main anti-Jewish agitator of all times, could hardly have excelled Fritsche when it came to libels against the Jews. I protest against this statement. I do not believe that I deserve any such accusation. Never did I give out any propaganda dealing with ritual murders, Kabala, and the protocols of the Elders of Zion.

At every period of my life I considered these machinations of a rather primitive agitation. For humanitarian reasons, I regret that I had to give further statement but I cannot refrain from making this statement in the interests of Truth.

My co-workers and I, in the press and on the radio, without exception rejected the "Stuermer". I personally during a period of 13 years never quoted

this paper; and the "Stuermer" was not quoted in the German press. The editors during my term of office did not belong to the Journalistic Union; the publisher did not belong to the publishers' organization or union during my term of office. How things developed along these lines later on, I did not know.

As I have already stated in my affidavit, I tried twice to prohibit the "Stuermer". However, I did not succeed. Then it was proposed that I censor this paper, the "Stuermer". However, I declined the offer. I wanted to prohibit the publishing of the "Stuermer", not just for the simple reason of prohibiting only one page of the newspaper "Stuermer", which was the most effective anti-German propaganda which ever existed, but I wanted to prohibit the whole of the "Stuermer" for reasons of good taste. I wanted to have it stand out as a source of radicalism against which I fought in every line and at every place.

The great secret for the tremendous increase in the circulation of the "Stuermer" after 1933 to half a million lay in the same cause as the secret of the sudden increase of such organizations as the SA. The Party in 1933 had blocked the bringing in of new members, and presently many people tried to affiliate themselves, if not directly with the party, then with some organization connected with the Party, such as, perhaps, the SA. Or they tried to be able to prove that they had a connection with some National Socialist organization, and to be related to it, by subscribing to the "Stuermer", or something similar.

Therefore, in that sense, I was not anti-Semitic, but I was anti-Semitic in this sense : I wanted a restriction of the predominant influence of Jewry in German politics, economy, and culture, such as it had manifested itself after the First World War. I wanted a restriction to that extent so that the relative importance of the participation of the Jews would be in line with the population.

H0167 - 0025

All restrictions were up to that degree, so that the proportionate participation of the Jews would be in line with the population of Germany and this view of mine which I held, I proclaimed publicly but I did not exploit these views in a systematic propaganda light or way. Those anti-Semitic statements with which I am charged by the prosecution have a different connection. The facts are as follows: After the outbreak of the war, frequently I referred to the fact that Jewish emigrees, immediately after 1933, were the first ones to emphasize that a war against the National Socialist German State is necessary; for instance, Emil Ludwig or George Bernhardt and others. As far as I recall, this was the only connection in which I made anti-Semitic statements of any kind. I cannot say this without being asked to be permitted to emphasize one more point. Only in this proceeding here did I learn that in the Autumn of 1939 there was more at stake than just one city or one street for a way through the Corridor; that in truth and in fact, a new division or partition of Poland had already been declared only perhaps in part and only here in this proceeding did I learn that Hitler had confirmed the warnings against the Jews by the terrible act of a murder. If I had known both of these things at that time, then I would have pictured the role of Jewish propaganda quite differently before the outbreak of the war.

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, in this connection I should like to refer to the document which has already been submitted, Fritsche Exhibit No. 2, deposed by Dr. Scharping, with special reference to pages nine to eleven. This document is found in my Document Book No. 2; however, I don't know whether this document book has been submitted to the High Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, it has.

DR. FRITZ: Pages nine to eleven. I would just like to refer to the contents of this document. The prosecution has quoted a passage from the book by Mueller, dealing with the Propaganda Ministry. According to this, among other things, it was the task of this Ministry to enlighten the population about the Jewish question.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q. According to the picture drawn by the prosecution, matters stood as though you were the one charged with the task of this enlightenment; is that correct ?

H0167 - 0026

A. No.

The "Department Jewry", that was a branch of the Propaganda Ministry which carried on all this propaganda. I never managed this department of propaganda.

Q. I should like to interpolate a question. The defendant Streicher, on the 29th of April, testified and stated that the Propaganda Ministry published National Socialist correspondence which, of course, was sent to "Der Stuermer" as well and in other pamphlets several other anti-Semitic articles were contained. Is that true ?

A. No. National Socialist correspondence was not published by the Propaganda Ministry but by the Reich President of the NSDAP; however, I did not have the impression as though the rather remarkable policy followed by "Der Stuermer" had been characterized through these articles. On the other hand, "Der Stuermer" may have brought one or the other article which was given out by the NSK.

Q. The prosecution quoted a passage from a speech which was made over the radio on the 18th of December 1941. This speech will be found in my document book no. 1, pages 26 to 32. It contains the entire speech. In this instance,

H0167 - 0027

H0167 - 0028

you said that "the fate of Jewry in Europe had been rather uncomfortable and that this fate in all probability would stretch over to the New World as well." The prosecution holds the view that this was a proclamation of further actions in the persecution of Jews, that you intended to carry through further Jewish persecution. What can you tell us about this?

A In this quotation, I discussed the uncomfortable fate of Jewry in Europe. According to the things that we know today, this must look as though I had meant the murder of Jews but in this connection, I should like to explain and state at that time I did not know about these murders; therefore I could not have meant it. I did not even mean the evacuation of Jews, for even this factor was something which was not carried out in Berlin until a year or two later. What I meant was simply the elimination of Jews from politics and economy, economic life and the expression "uncomfortable" hints at this and is an expression which would be quite inexplicable in its likeness and why did I speak about the Jews in America in this connection? The sentence quoted by the prosecution is very closely connected with a report which precedes it in this speech, that a Jewish National Council had told President Roosevelt that they wanted to enter the war. Not even this connection of thought, which is understandable now, that was not brought in by me without good reason. The largest part of this speech in question, perhaps nine-tenths of it, in fact, deals with that investigation commission which were beign used in the United States to investigate the causes of Pearl Harbor.

THE PRESIDENT: There are a lot of pages in this.

DR. FRITZ: The document book No. 1, Mr. President, pages 26 to 32.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes; I wanted to know whether first of all we are on page 31.

DR. FRITZ: He is referring in his statements, which he is making now, to the entire contents of the speech, Mr. President. The prosecution had quoted only the last paragraph of this speech.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q Please continue.

A I was speaking polemically in this speech and I advised not only whether on the weapons or the arms of the Americans they maybe had been inattentive and I advised to check also in American politics, whether someone

H0167 - 0029

might not have been interested in the outbreak of the war and in this connection, I reminded that an investigating committee of the American Senate, twenty years after the first world war, was investigating the entry of the United States into the first world war. I said verbatim: "This Senate Committee proved that Wilson deliberately or not deliberately upon his entrance into the war, was the victim of several war mongers."

THE PRESIDENT: The investigation committee of the Americans about the entry into the last war? Isn't he going rather far back?

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, I believe that the defendant can stop at this point. He wanted to show with this point only, with this quotation, that was the last paragraph, the one quoted by the prosecution, to incriminate him; that this paragraph was torn from its contents, that is the fact he wanted to show, Mr. President.

H0167 - 0030

The second quotation used by the prosecution in this connection is an excerpt from a radio speech of the 18th of March, 1941. The Prosecution was of the opinion that this was an incitement for the persecution of Jews, and they said, further, that it was proof of the Propagand Ministry's endorsement of the master race.

Mr. President, this speech of the 18th of March, 1941, may be found in my document book No. 1, pages 2 to 7.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q The prosecution quoted only one paragraph from this speech. What can you tell us in this connection? Please comment on this.

A I do not wish to read this quotation. I rather ask you that you read it carefully yourself and after you have read it you can see that I completely agreed with Mr. Roosevelt when he said that there was no master race. I endorsed the correctness of this sentence not only as applied to Germany and the German people but to Jewry as well. The prosecution concluded from this sentence that it was a justification for acts committed in Jewish persecutions in the past and that it was a foreboding of more persecutions to come. I can not quite understand this conclusion. It is not justified.

THE PRESIDENT: In our copy there is no date at the top of Page 2 of your Volume 1. -- Yes, I see it is in the index. Which page of it is the passage that the prosecution quotes?

DR. FRITZ: On Page 5 under Point 5, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Very well.

DR. FRITZ: It begins with the word: "But the crown --" and so forth. That is the quotation used by the prosecution.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q The third quotation used by the prosecution brought a passage from the speech which you made on the 9th of October, 1941.

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, this is to be found in Document Book No. 1, Pages 20 to 25; the entire speech will be found on these pages.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q The prosecution quoted but one paragraph from this speech as well.

H0167 - 0031

In this paragraph, you, Mr. Fritsche, are speaking about a new wave of international Jewish, democratic, Bolshevistic agitation. What can you tell us about this?

A I have to say but little in this connection. This speech was made in those days of the sutumn of 1941 when the Reich's Press Chiefhad announced that German victory in the East had been decisive. I had warned the entire German Press about taking this slogan without reservations. I did not believe in this decision which supposedly had already taken place. I suggested to all German newspapers to speak about a prolonged duration of the war. In this speech of mine I wanted to decrease the effectiveness of the official victory bulletin. Therefore, in this speech , and perhaps for the first time in G ermany, I mentioned those three factors which, in fact, later on determined the war, the struggle against Germany in the East: First of all, the partisans; secondly, the international help in the way of munitions; and thirdly, propaganda. This last part alone was quoted by the prosecution. As I have already said, this last part is quite in accord with the knowledge and opinion I held at that time.

Q The next quotation used by the prosecution was an extract from a speech which you made on the 8th of January, 1944.

DR. FRITZ: The complete speech, Mr. President, may be found in my document Book No. 1. It is speech No. 7, to be found on Pages 40 to 45.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q In this speech you are stating that it wasn't a new form of government or a new form of Socialism which had brought about the war but rather the agitation of Jews and plutocrats was responsible for this. How did you come to make that speech?

A For justification in this case as well, I should like to refer to everything that I have already said, and beyond that, I should like to emphasize that this rather heated accusation was not made by me just out of the blue or just because I wanted to agitate. If I may be permitted to do so, I should like to picture the connection to you briefly. The topic of this speech was the differences of opinion which existed at

H0167-0032

that time between the Polish Emigree Government at Moscow--rather, at London, and the Soviet Government at Moscow. There was a matter of territorial demands which they disagreed on, and on this occasion I quoted the London Times word for word. The London Times said that "the relinquishing of the Polish regions, as demanded by Russia, was only a small and modest price for the absolute and reliable guarantee to Poland of help through the Soviet Union." This statement made by the London Times I used as a matter of course in a polemic statement in which I said: "Yes, if the Times had said these things in August of 1939, that we were concerned only with a city and with a road, then there wouldn't have been any war," and so forth. On this occasion I should like to state, all of these quotations, almost without exception, show only the combination of the concepts, Jews, plutocrats, Bolsheviks. The question of race was not the primary one, but the thing that was primary was the ideological struggle as it seemed to my mind, to be taking place.

Q. And the fourth quotation used by the prosecution, they referred to a speech which you made on the 13th of January, 1945. The prosecution used some excerpts--

DR. FRITZ: Mr. President, this is speech No.8, contained in Document Book No.1, to be found on pages 46 to 51. The prosecution in this case is quoting but two paragraphs, one on page 50 of my document book, paragraph 2.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q. In these quotations the prosecution said that there is a Jewish influence on the British policies. How could you make these statements? What were your reasons?

A. The prosecution believe it to be possible to conclude from this quotation that it was the introduction to further persecution of the Jews, and to a complete destruction of the Jews. This conclusion, however, is not justified and proved, neither in the word nor in the sense nor when seen in the light of the context. In this case I shall forego giving you my

picture of theconnections, not even to give you a brief summary. It can be seen and can be gathered when you read the speech in question. However, I can not see how an appeal for the destruction of the Jews is being given in this speech of mine.

Q. As far as crimes against humanity are concerned, in that connection you are accused of libel against the Jews, and the logical conclusion or result was further persecutions. Therefore, I want to ask you about the murder of Jews. Did you know the decree of Hitler's, as testified by the witness Hoess, a decree according to which the Jews were to be murdered?

A. I should like to state under my oath, that I did not know of this order of Hitler's. If I had know it, I would not have served that person who had given this order for another hour. I should like to state further that this decree, as well as this entire complex action, was concealed with specific care from me and my coworkers, because I almost tracked this down; I came upon its traces and tracks.

H0167 - 0033

H0167 - 0034

Q At any time did you receive instructions for the killing of a large number of innocent people?

A Yes. In February or March 1942 I received a letter from an SS leader of the Ukraine. However, I do not recall this man's name. The contents of the letter were to the effect that the author of the letter was the commander of an SS unit, that he had had a decree to kill the Jewish intelligents of his area, and upon the receipt of this order, he had suffered a nervous breakdown and that he was in the hospital at the present time.

It seemed to him that a complaint along official channels was quite impossible for him. He said he did not know me; however he was trusting me, had confidence in me that perhaps I could help in some way, and he asked me not to mention his name since he was bound to silence with his life.

Without meditating or contemplating much, immediately upon receipt of this letter, I called Heydrich, the Obergruppenfuehrer of the RSHA and the Gestapo. I hardly knew him personally, but he declared himself quite willing to receive me immediately. I visited him, and in an unembroidered way put this question to him: Is your SS here for the purpose of committing mass murders?

Heydrich was quite indignant at this question, and stated the following things. He said that larger or smaller SS units had been sent out by him for police and supervisory purposes. He had given these units to be used by various ministers, Reich commissars, and so forth. These special details of SS men had been misused on various occasions, and he thought this might apply to the unit which had been placed at the disposal of Gauleiter Koch.

Heydrich told me that he would have an investigation started immediately. He next noon he called me from headquarters as he said he would, and he said that for a fact this action had been tried, and it had been tried on the order of Koch. Koch, for his part, had referred to the Fuehrer for his authority, and had received it from him. He said that the Fuehrer had not defined his position and that I would hear it as soon as possible.

Two days later, Heydrich asked me to come and visit him. On that occasion, he said Hitler had declared that he had not given this order; Koch now said that there was a misunderstanding and I was further told that Koch would be investigated and that steps had been started. At any rate, Heydrich

H0167-0035

promised me that this action would not be carried through, and I remember particularly well one sentence which was used in this discussion, and this applies to a declaration by Heydrich:

"Believe me, Mr. Fritsche, a person who has the reputation of being cruel does not have to be cruel. He can act humanly."

Shortly thereafter, I was made a soldier and asked to be sent to the Sixth Army and was sent to the Ukraine.

THE PRESIDENT: Wait a minute. I didn't understand that last sentence. Heydrich said "Believe me, Mr. Fritsche..." and then --

THE WITNESS: "Anyone who has the reputation of being cruel does not have to be cruel. He can act humanly."

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but then he went on about going to the Sixth Army.

THE WITNESS: Yes, shortly thereafter I became a soldier.

DR. FRITZ: He added, Mr. President, that shortly after this meeting with Heydrich, he himself, that is the defendant Fritsche, became a soldier and he specifically asked to be detailed to the Sixth Army which at that time was stationed in the Ukraine.

THE PRESIDENT: What was the date of this incident?

THE WITNESS: February-March 1942.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q In the Ukraine, when you were active as a soldier, did youtry to check and investigate the statements of Heydrich as to their correctness and authenticity?

A I had no official capacity to do this, but as an old journalist I started to investigate on my own.

First of all, I investigated in Kiev, with the local German radio station, and the answer was yes, several shootings actually did take place, specifically after the blowing up of certain housing blocks, an occasion upon which many German soldiers lost their lives, and these were shootings according to martial law.

Then, for three days I travelled back and forth between Kiev and Boltava. Mostly I travelled alone. I found the population there in utmost peace; there were no signs of terror whatsoever, and I was received very well

H0167-0036

everywhere I went.

At Boltava, I checked with officers and soldiers. On these occasions as well, I was told, "Yes, there were some sentences after court martials at Kharkov, and the reason for these sentences was sabotage."

Then, in Kharkov itself, I visited the SS Command which was stationed there, and I spoke with the Sturmfuehrer Rexlach. He denied any shooting actions. He showed me the prison. There were perhaps 50 people there, certainly no more. I asked him about camps and he stated that there were none.

Then I visited a Ukrainian family; I questioned a German agricultural leader at Belgrade, and I met with the same result in every case: No shooting actions took place.

I gathered from that that the specific measure had not been carried through.

Q Before this letter which the SS man had sent you, didn't you have suspicion, perhaps from Allied radio broadcasts which you had access to?

A These radio broadcasts were accessible to me, reports about atrocities. I had these reports specially gathered at that time from the great amount of enemy broadcasts which we received every day, and then I had these reports investigated and checked.

Q And who concerned himself with this checking?

A The experts, Oberregierungsrat Koerber who was the manager of the department "Schnelldienst" or one of his co-workers, or myself.

Q And who checked with whom?

A We inquired of the RSHA, for in most cases in these reports there was mention of the SS or Gestapo. They were mentioned as the ones who had perpetrated the murders in these reports of atrocity cases.

Q Among which of the many branches of this office did you inquire?

A We inquired at the various special experts' offices, and I do not doubt that we inquired of Eichmann, who has been mentioned in these proceedings here. Apart from that, we inquired of Sturmahnfuehrer Spengler or his deputy Kiepinsky, both of them members of that office which, at that time or later, was taken over by Ohlendorf who has appeared here as a witness also.

Frequently we inquired among the other offices of the Reichssicherheitshauptamt, and some police agencies as well, especially if there were reports

H0167 - 0037

from a special area.

Q What were the answers you received?

A We always received the answer that the report in question was either completely wrong and was an invention, or that the report had this or that legal basis.

H0167-0038

Frequently figures and details were reported in reports which in effect were quite disarming.

Q Is there anything set down in writing about this?

A Yes. The important questions and answers were put in writing and partially they were multigraphed and sent to the various agencies within and outside the Propaganda Ministry. All the material was collected in the archives "Schnelldienst", material for which I applied but which has not been found.

Q Then, did you just believe these answers as they came to you?

A Yes, I did believe them for these were pieces of information which were given to me by official sources and I had experienced on numerous occasions that the authenticity of these reports from these sources, to whom I applied had been proved very drastically.

Q What do you mean by that?

A I might perhaps give you just one example. The first propaganda of the war was that the report which was given out by Warsaw about the destruction of the picture "Black Madonna" of Zehnstachau. This report was transmitted around the world. We took German and foreign journalists to Zehnstachau, who could prove and check the fact that this report was not true.

I have to be quite honest here and must say that I really wanted to cite another example in reply to this question put by my counsel, an example which really had its after-effects for mein this Courtroom some two or three days ago.

The British newspaper "The News Chronicle", on 24 September, 1939, had brought out the news --

THE PRESIDENT: What is the evidential value of the "News Chronicle", in 1939?

DR. FRITZ: The defendant wants to prove to the High Tribunal that he found that that many reports from abroad, dealing with German atrocities, actually were wrong and incorrect so that --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we do not need details about that. No doubt there were frequent reports which were not accurate. We do not want you to go into details.

THE WITNESS: I wanted to prove with just one bit of news and one report, how at that time something could be denied which the world believed and then, in the shadow of this denial, quite unnoticed by ghe German public opinion, something did take place, such as a larger wave of arrests or a similar matter.

THE PRESIDENT: He can state the facts but he need not go into detail about particular issue of the newspaper.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q Was it only once, Mr. Fritsche, that the falsehood of such foreign broadcasts were ascertained by you?

A No, that took place quite frequently.

Q Please be very brief, Mr. Fritsche.

A One of my co-workers gathered material under the title "In seven weeks of war a list of 108 cases." The gathering of these reports, given out by our enemy, gave me a feeling of moral superiority as applied to that kind of reporting and this feeling was the basis of my later works, a work which could not be explained without this feeling.

Q Did you not conceive the thought that these wrong reports took place and occurred only in the beginning of the war?

A No, that thought never occurred to me. The reports were so numerous in the beginning and I could check them in later years, especially as to my own person.

Q How, to your own person, can you give us just a few brief words, just one statement out of many?

A A hostile bit of propaganda accused me of the fact that six hundred thousand Swedish --

THE PRESIDENT: What is the purpose of this?

DR. FRITZ: I want to show how false statement about him was made how a wrong statement was applied to him personally. He wanted to state that briefly.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, as I said already, there were, no doubt, erroneous statements made in the foreign press and every press. We cannot investigate those sort of matters.

DR. FRITZ: Then we shall pass on. We shall turn to another question.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q Did you not, as an experienced journalist, in the

H0167-0039

news service, have the feeling that where there is smoke there is fire? Did you not believe that at least something must be true of the enemy reports about murders and so forth in the German areas?

A. This feeling, as a specialist in reporting, I did not have. Again and again I thought and I also reminded the public of one erroneous bit of reporting of the First World War and I beg the Tribunal to grant me permission to mention this erroneous report briefly for it is the fundamentals of propaganda which I carried on.

THE PRESIDENT: No, I have already pointed out that we assume that there are a variety of errors. We do not want to go into detail.

DR. FRITZ: Then I shall turn to another question.

BY DR. FRITZ:

Q. But you knew for certain that the Jews had been transported away from the Reich, and you noticed that they disappeared from the streets?

A. Yes, that I did notice, even though this incident occurred very gradually, and up and beyond that I heard on one occasion how Dr. Goebbels mentioned, on the occasion of a ministerial conference, that a Gauleiter in Berlin had put the demand for the transporting of Jews.

Q. And in your opinion where were these Jews taken, what were you told about these things?

A. Dr. Goebbels told me that they were being taken to reservations in Poland. Never was the assertion or the assumption made that they were being taken to concentration camps, or that they were even being murdered.

Q. Did you try to inquire about these reservations into which the Jews were allegedly being taken?

A. Of course I did that. I learned something as was told me by a former co-worker of mine who had gone over into the administration of the Government General and who had a position in the region Biala-Podlaska. He said that this area of his,

H0167 - 0040

H0167 - 0041

under his control, had become a Jewish area, and he pictured the arrival and the housing of these transportees. He also mentioned the difficulties and the employment of Jews as workers as mechanics and on plantations. The picture he drew for me was drawn as a condition of humanity, and he told me that on his tract of land, the Jews were faring better than they were in the Reich.

Q. What was the name of this man?

A. Oberregierungsrat Robert Kuehl.

Q. Did you hear unfavorable news about these deported Jews?

A. Yes. Sturmbannfuehrer Radke of the staff of the Reichsfuehrer SS reported, perhaps in the winter of 1942, that the mortality rate of the Jews in the eastern ghetts was abnormally high because of the changeover from spiritual to manual labor, and he mentioned there was some typhus, some isolated cases of this disease.

Apart from that Dr. Tauber, who was head of the department dealing with Jewish questions in the Propaganda Ministry, told me in the year 1941, if I remember correctly, that in the occupation of Lemberg and Kovno pogroms had resulted, Jewish pogroms, but they were carried out by the local population. He assured me at the same time that the German authorities had taken steps against these pogroms. The references to things of that kind caused me to criticize matters severely, even though these things today look insignificant compared with the knowledge at our disposal today. This criticism by me was exercised against my subordinates, and was also specially directed against co-workers and against members of the Gestapo and members of the party. Again and again I referred to the legal, political and moral necessity of the protection of these Jews, who had been entrusted to our care.

Q. Did you learn anything else about the fate of these Jews?

A. On many occasions Jews or relatives of Jews turned to me because of arrests or because they had been discriminated against

as well as against non-Jews in large numbers. All this did cause my name to become well-known to the public. Without exception, I made these requests as my own and I tried to help. I tried to help through various offices, through the RS HA, through the personnel section of my ministry, through particular ministers and particular Gauleiters.

H0167 - 0042

H0167 - 0043

Q. Why did you turn to so many different authorities and offices?

A. Many, many requests were involved, and if my name had been used too many times, the effecticeness of my name would have been exhausted very quickly.

Q. Did you on occasion turn down these requests?

A. No, not in a single instance, and I should like to emphasize especially the fact, for a letter addressed to me in this prison here was not handed over to me but was published in the press instead. It was a letter in which a woman asserted that I had turned down a request for pardon. I remember this case exactly, and I should like to emphasize, but briefly, that in this case I had called --

THE PRESIDENT: It is sufficient for him to say that he did not turn them down. We do not want one instance of somebody who wrote to him.

How long are you going to be, Dr. Fritz?

DR. FRITZ: I believe I shall be able to conclude the entire case tomorrow morning, the entire case Fritsche.

Mr. President, I have just heard that there is no open session this afternoon.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

DR. FRITZ: Otherwise I would have been able to conclude the entire case Fritsche today. However, in this event, I hope to be able to conclude my examination in chief of the defendant and to call the witness, and I hope that tomorrow noon I shall be able to conclude.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal hopes so too, because, as I have pointed out to you, we do not want you to go into such elaborate detail. You have been going, in the opinion of the Tribunal, far too much into detail, and we want the matter dealt with more generally.

(The Tribunal adjourned until 28 June 1946, 1000 hours.)